



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

C.W.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,969	01/18/2000	Brian E. Farley	VNUS-53427	9082

24201 7590 01/28/2003

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE
TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, CRIS LOIREN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/483,969

Applicant(s)

FARLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Cris L. Rodriguez

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35,37,44-47,54,56-59,62-64,69-71,75 and 76 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34,36,38-40, 43,48-50, 52, 53,55,60,61,65,66, 68,72-74,77 and 78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 41,42,51,67 and 79-82 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 34, 36, 38, 48, and 53 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 10, and 12-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,139,527. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claims a catheter having extendable members, and electrodes located at the extendable members.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after

Art Unit: 3763

November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 34, 38, 43, 48, 52, 53, 55, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Behl et al (US 5,709,224).

Behl discloses a catheter (figs 5-9C) having a working end at **56**, and at least two electrodes **70** to cause shrinkage of a blood vessel. See col. 5 lines 28-45 for preferential shrinkage.

5. Claims 68, 72-74, 77, 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fleischman (US 5,885,278).

Fleischman discloses an ablation catheter, (figs 7-11A), having a working end 22, and at least four exposed, electrically conductive surfaces 20(1) located at the distal end of the catheter, a plurality of electrically conductive lines (figs 10-11A) electrically connected to the exposed surfaces. Fleischman also discloses the ablation catheter having electrodes 34, and the electrodes having temperature sensors 68 to measure the temperature of the hollow anatomical structure (Col. 10, lines 10-25). The ablation catheter can be used in other regions of the body (col. 6 lines 20-25). In column 9 lines 25-32, Fleischman set forth that the electrodes could be in a bi-polar mode in which the ablation energy emitted by one electrode 28 is returned through another element on the spline leg 22 reading on the "pair of exposed surfaces of unlike polarity" of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3763

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 34, 36, 38-40, 43, 48-50, 52, 53, 55, 60, 61, 65, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleischman in view of Behl.

Fleischman discloses an ablation catheter and a method for applying energy as discussed above. However, Fleischman is moot to cause preferential shrinkage of a vein.

Behl teaches an ablation catheter having electrodes to apply energy and cause shrinkage of an anatomical structure, such as veins and other body lumens (col. 5 lines 17-27). The energy applied is between ranges 200kHz to 1.25MHz. This range falls between the ranges as applicants. Given the teachings it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Behl's energy ranges with Fleischman's ablation catheter. Doing so would have shrunk the hollow anatomical structure, and sensed the temperature of the site during the medical procedure.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 41, 42, 51, 67, and 79-82 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed December 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not fully persuasive.

Art Unit: 3763


10. In response to applicant's argument that the references "do not produce directional RF field" to cause preferential shrinkage as recited in claim 34, or the "directional energy application apparatus" as recited in claim 53, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cris L. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 308-2194. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (703) 308-3552. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3590 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

January 27, 2003


Cris L. Rodriguez
Examiner
Art Unit 3763


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700